Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-09)

Approved for use through 07/31/2012. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional)		
		I-1-0064.5US		
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]	Application Number		Filed	
	10/757,222		January 14, 2004	
on	First Named Inventor			
Signature	John David Kaewell Jr.			
A			Examiner	
Typed or printed name	2618		Junpeng Chen	
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal. The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.				
I am the				
applicant/inventor.	/Robert D. Leonard/			
assignee of record of the entire interest.	Signature Robert D. Leonard			
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)	Typed or printed name			
attorney or agent of record. F7 204		568-6400		
Registration number	_•	Telephone number		
attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.	August 13, 2009			
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34		Date		
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.				
*Total of forms are submitted.				

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Privacy Act Statement

The **Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579)** requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

- The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
- 2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
- A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record
- 4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
- 5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
- 6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
- 7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (i.e., GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
- 8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
- A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

I-1-0064.5US

August 13, 2009

Our File:

Date:

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the **PATENT APPLICATION** of:

John David Kaewell Jr. et al.

Application No.: 10/757,222

Confirmation No.: 3792

Filed: January 14, 2004

For: SUBSCRIBER TERMINAL TEMPERATURE REGULATION

Group:

2618

Examiner:

Junpeng Chen

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Mail Stop AF (Via EFS) Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

A Pre-Appeal Brief Review is hereby requested in the above identified patent application, for the reason that the Examiner has not cited a reference which discloses at least one intermediate power consumption level as recited in the currently pending claims.

Claims 9-12, 14-16, 18-22, 24-32, 34-36, and 38-39 are currently pending in this application. These claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over 5,150,361 to Wieczorek et al. (hereinafter Wieczorek).

Application No.: 10/757,222

In the August 4, 2009 Advisory Action, the Examiner maintains the rejection

of the pending claims stating as follows.

Wieczorek discloses a low power mode (read as the claimed at least one intermediate power consumption level mode, wherein only essential circuit elements are on), a non-energy saving mode (read as the claimed on power consumption level mode, wherein all circuits are activated for communication). In addition, as well known in the art, when the communication device, which operate under power supplied by battery, is turned off (i.e. powered off by pressing the power off key to deactivate all circuits an no power consumptions at all), it is in off

power consumption mode.

As previously argued, Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejection is improper as the Examiner is reading the low power mode taught by Wieczorek as both the claimed off power consumption level and the claimed at least one

intermediate power consumption level.

The portion of Wieczorek upon which the Examiner relies is reproduced

below.

According to the invention, the communication unit may be made to function in one of two operational mode: a low power or energy saving mode and a high power or non energy saving mode. (see Wieczorek,

column 5, lines 4-7, emphasis added.)

Clearly Wieczorek discloses only two operational modes. Wieczorek further defines operation of various device components in the "low power or energy saving mode"

introduced above as follows.

- 2 -

In order to conserve energy, the controller 320 periodically <u>deactivates</u> non-essential circuits...(see Wieczorek, column 4, lines 45-47, emphasis added).

Wieczorek only teaches fully activated circuit components or fully deactivated circuit components, as evidenced by the above citations. Accordingly, Wieczorek only teaches <u>two</u> power consumption levels. These two power consumption levels taught by Wieczorek consist of a fully powered, on power consumption level and a deactivated, powered down, off power consumption level.

As noted above, the Examiner states that "Wieczorek discloses a low power mode (read as the claimed at least one intermediate power consumption level mode, wherein only essential circuit elements are on)." Wieczorek discloses that non-essential circuits may be periodically deactivated in order to conserve energy. A deactivated circuit in the low power or energy saving mode taught by Wieczorek is in an identical power state as when the communication unit is powered off. Thus these power modes are equivalent, and Wieczorek therefore only teaches two power modes.

The Examiner fails to show a teaching in Wieczorek of the claimed intermediate power consumption level, that by its plain meaning is a power consumption level between an on power consumption level and an off power

consumption level. It is respectfully submitted that Wieczorek fails to teach or even

suggest an intermediate power consumption level as claimed.

Although not clear in any of the Examiner's rejections, the Examiner may be

interpreting the power save mode of Wieczorek where some circuit components are

on and some are off to be equivalent to the claimed intermediate power consumption

level. If this is the case, the Examiner is reminded that the pending claims recite a

plurality of circuit components...having an on power consumption level, an off power

consumption level, and at least one intermediate power consumption level. In other

words, the claimed power consumption levels are related to each of a plurality of

circuit components, not the entire TDMA wireless subscriber unit. Wieczorek does

not teach an on power consumption level, an off power consumption level, and at

least one intermediate power consumption level for each of a plurality of circuit

components. As detailed above, Wieczorek only teaches two power states for a

circuit component.

Furthermore, the Examiner's assertion that the powered off state of the

communication device ("i.e. powered off by pressing the power off key to deactivate

all circuits and no power consumptions at all") is a signal processing state as

claimed is improper. The claims recite at least one of the plurality of circuit

components transition[] among the plurality of signal processing states based on a

- 4 -

Applicant: John David Kaewell, Jr. et al.

Application No.: 10/757,222

time slot of a TDMA frame. It is not possible to transition[] among the plurality of

signal processing states based on a time slot of a TDMA frame, as claimed, where

one of the plurality of signal processing states is a state where the entire

communication device is powered off. A transition to/from a state in response to

pressing a button is not equivalent to transitioning to/from a state based on a time

slot.

Independent claims 9, 19, and 29 recite similar elements. Claims 10-12, 14-

16, and 18 are dependent upon claim 9, claims 20-22, 24-28 are dependent upon

claims 19, and claims 30-32, 34-36, and 38-39 are dependent upon claim 29.

Applicants believe these claims are allowable over the cited references of record for

the reasons provided above.

Based on these arguments, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection is

respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Kaewell et al.

By /Robert D. Leonard/

Robert D. Leonard Registration No. 57,204

(215) 568-6400

Volpe and Koenig, P.C. United Plaza, Suite 1600 30 South 17th Street

Philadelphia, PA 19103

- 5 -

1056918-1